

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are rejected. Claims 1-23 are pending. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants believe that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

### 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

The present Office Action states on page 2, paragraph 4: "Claim 22 is rejected under U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter." Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 has been amended herein. As such, the Applicants respectfully request removal of this claim rejection.

### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-12 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,983,374 (hereinafter Hashimoto).

### Claims 1-11

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 1 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A memory architecture, comprising:

an unprotected memory space configured to store encrypted information, said encrypted information corresponding to a plain text version thereof;

a message digest corresponding to said encrypted information;

a first protected memory space configured to store at least a subset of operating system instructions; and

a second protected memory space configured to store said plain text version of said encrypted information;

wherein said operating system instructions in said first protected memory space operate on said plain text version of said encrypted information in said second protected memory space.

Applicants respectfully contend that Hashimoto fails to teach the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 1. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Hashimoto does not teach "a message digest

corresponding to said encrypted information" as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Therefore, since Hashimoto fails to teach elements as recited in amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and is thus in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 2-11, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 2-11 depend from allowable amended independent Claim 1 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-11 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### Claims 12

Based on the rationale discussed above with reference to amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 12 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and is thus in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 17-22

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 17 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A method of operating on encrypted information, comprising:  
transferring said encrypted information to a first protected memory address inaccessible to a user-accessible software program, but accessible to an operating system instruction set;  
if said encrypted information comprises encrypted information, decrypting said encrypted information to form a decrypted version of said encrypted information, said decrypting comprises a message digest; and  
storing said first protected memory address in a second protected memory address inaccessible to a user-accessible software program, but accessible to an operating system instruction set, wherein said second protected memory address is linked to an original location of said encrypted information.

Applicants respectfully contend that Hashimoto fails to teach the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 17. For example,

Applicants respectfully assert that Hashimoto does not teach "decrypting said encrypted information to form a decrypted version of said encrypted information, said decrypting comprises a message digest" as recited in amended independent Claim 17. Therefore, since Hashimoto fails to teach elements as recited in amended independent Claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 17 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and is thus in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 18-22, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 18-22 depend from allowable amended independent Claim 17 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 18-22 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### Claim 23

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 23 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A system for hiding information, comprising:  
one or more units of information to be hidden;  
a unique identifier for each of said units of information;  
one or more tools configured to hide each of the units of information at a known location in protected memory that comprises ROM; and  
a second location in protected memory for storing each of said unique identifiers and a corresponding known location in protected memory where the corresponding unit of information is hidden.

Applicants respectfully contend that Hashimoto fails to teach the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 23. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Hashimoto does not teach "one or more tools configured to hide each of the units of information at a known location in protected memory that comprises ROM" as recited in amended independent Claim 23. Therefore, since Hashimoto fails to teach elements as recited in amended independent Claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 23

overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and is thus in condition for allowance.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto and further in view of Barnett, U.S. Patent No. 6,292,874 (hereinafter Barnett).

### Claims 13-16

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended independent Claim 12 that recites an embodiment of the invention (emphasis added):

A system for operating on encrypted information, comprising:  
a processor; and  
a memory architecture of comprising:  
an unprotected memory space configured to store encrypted information, said encrypted information corresponding to a plain text version thereof;  
a message digest corresponding to said encrypted information;  
a first protected memory space configured to store at least a subset of operating system instructions; and  
a second protected memory space configured to store said plain text version of said encrypted information, wherein said operating system instructions in said first protected memory space operate on said plain text version of said encrypted information in said second protected memory space;  
wherein said processor is configured to execute said operating system instructions.

Applicants respectfully contend that Hashimoto and Barnett, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited combination of elements as recited in amended independent Claim 12. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Hashimoto and Barnett, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "a message digest corresponding to said encrypted information" as recited in amended Claim 12. Therefore, since Hashimoto and Barnett, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest elements as recited in amended independent Claim 12, Applicants respectfully

submit that amended Claim 12 overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and is thus in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 13-16, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 13-16 depend from allowable amended independent Claim 12 and recite further embodiments of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-16 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

### CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that pending Claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance and that action is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: JULY 9, 2007



Thomas M. Catale  
Registration No.: 46,434

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060  
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069